Vol. IX, No. 25 HUMAN EVENTS June 18, 1952

THE OVERRIDING ISSUE — DEFENSE

By Bonner Fellers, Brig. Gen. U.S.A., Ret'd.

As the various candidates for the nomination of both parties approach their conventions, a welter of issues — centralized government, economy, taxes, foreign policy — divide the aspirants. But the biggest issue of all — what kind of defense shall we have — should be the test on which candidates stand or fall.

Upon how we solve this problem of defense rests the momentous issues of inflation or sound economy, war or peace. Since these turbulent times demand the most powerful defense possible, an examination of how best to go about it is supremely in order.

That something is wrong with our defense is clear. In Korea, the Administration seems to be at the end of its rope. The failure of the ten months' cease-fire talks continues the war of attrition against Red China's inexhaustible manpower. The inadequacy of European containment preparations makes that picture more tolerable than Korea only because there is no shooting in Europe.

When World War II ended the United States was, militarily, the most powerful country of all time. Since V-J day we have spent nearly $200 billion on defense and foreign aid, yet our position in Korea is precarious, Europe's defenses lag, and our home security is far from adequate.

How did the United States, the most productive and powerful nation on earth, arrive at such an ignominious position? It is obviously because our grand strategy has failed.

Most Americans subscribe to the State Department's policy to contain Red expansion and to hope for the collapse of Kremlin domination. The military implementation of containment, however, follows antiquated military concepts. And the State Department's efforts to undermine Kremlin domination are at best puny: they amount to nothing more than threatening the Russians with dollar-supported friends.

In the critical areas of Korea and Europe, our plan is to hold a line with Allied ground forces. The object of holding the line is not to win, rather it is to hold while someway, somehow, a peace favorable to us can be negotiated.

Meanwhile the basic military strategy is that final decision in war can be gained only by riflemen, supported by the other services.

As a consequence of this hold, wait and negotiate strategy, our cease-fire conversations in Korea have permitted the Reds to improve their position from one of extreme precariousness at the time of General MacArthur's dismissal to one of great strength. The Red forces now outnumber us on the ground nearly 3 to 1, and in the best jet fighters, 5 to 1. If the Reds should decide to strike, our Korean position would be seriously threatened.

In Europe NATO has gathered 25 to 30 divisions in various degrees of combat effectiveness. By the end of 1952, it is claimed, there will be 25 divisions in the field with 25 reserve divisions available within 30 days; some 4,000 aircraft are also expected.

Opposing these NATO forces are 175 Red divisions in European Russia. In addition, Central European satellites have about 60 effective divisions. These 235 Red divisions have the support of 20,000 Red Air Force combat planes.

One need not be a graduate of the National War College to realize that NATO forces of 50 divisions and 4,000 aircraft, if and when we get them, cannot possibly prevent 235 Red Divisions, with Red control of the air, from overrunning Europe. In fact, on June 14 a statement of General Bradley made behind closed doors to the Senate Military Appropriations Committee stated: "Russia could overrun Europe today. The Joint Chiefs of Staff believe that only fear of the United States atom bomb holds the Russians back."

Copyright 1952 by Human Events, Inc.
Published weekly at 1136 Eighteenth Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.
PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Even if the hoped for 12 German divisions were created and became part of the Allied forces, the odds against a ground defense of Europe would be insuperable. Nothing short of a United Germany, with no restrictions on rearming, could materially change the picture. But, to the French the memory of 1914 and 1940 is still too vivid to permit the removal of all curbs on German rearmament.

In addition to heavy commitments in Korea and Europe, American aid includes military alliances which make the United States the protector of Australia, New Zealand, Japan and the Phillipines. We are extending some assistance to Chiang Kai-shek. In Indo-China and Malaya, we are aiding the conflict of our European Allies against the Red supported local populations.

Meanwhile, the Red menace, moving south out of China, Tibet and Russia like a great prairie fire, threatens to engulf India, Pakistan and the Middle East. Communist propaganda exploits the conflict in Egypt, and the insurrection in North Africa. Our support of Europe's Colonial policy — a most un-American practice — wins for us the antipathy which all subject peoples hold against imperialists. Little or no UN forces are available to contain this Red threat in South Asia and the Middle East.

In short, with foot soldiers we are trying to effect a containment of the Red enslaved world — a quarter of the land surface of the earth containing 34 per cent of the world's population.

Children can't play the "Farmer in the Dell" unless they have enough players to join hands and circle the farmer. Yet our policy of containment contemplates our surrounding something larger than we are! Hence our present frustration.

EVEN IF THE CONCEPT for the containment of Red expansion had been sound, the atomic explosion in Russia should have stunned our planners into a new defense program.

For the sake of argument, let us assume that Allied forces could hold a line from Switzerland to the Channel. From air bases behind this line, the Red Air Force could place all Europe and Britain under atomic assault.

Russia's possession of the atomic bomb also greatly increased the vulnerability of the United States. Even if the Allied line in Europe were miraculously to hold firm, Red heavy bombers could strike our population centers and industrial areas from existing air bases in the Arctic region. One successful bomber sortie with an atomic bomb exploded over the target would have the effect of some 2,000 bomber missions with conventional bombs!

There is another atomic threat — equally great — to coastal cities. Russia has an estimated 400 first class submarines (more than twice the number Hitler had in 1939) from which it is already feasible to launch atomic rocket missiles with a range of 300 to 500 miles.

America and Europe built many of their cities and a major segment of their industry along the coasts; Russia's cities lie mostly in the interior. Consequently the Allies more than Russia are vulnerable to submarine-launched atomic missiles. Neither we nor our Allies have created adequate defense against these atomic threats.

In America we have only puny interceptor-fighter defenses. Our strategic bombers are so few in number that in war normal attrition losses would eliminate most of them before an atomic assault could be completed.

The atomic explosion in Russia changed our entire defense picture overnight. The explosion came several years before its scheduled arrival. It provided a face-saving opportunity for Administration planners to re-evaluate their entire defense program. It amounted to a clear call for a shift in military strategy from a principal reliance on ground forces to the creation of American air supremacy. From that time on, the static defense of Europe, which from the beginning was highly problematical, became utterly impossible. The presence of American ground troops on Europe's far-away frontiers became ridiculous so far as their extending security to Europe or the United States was concerned. Europe and America could be saved from Russia's atomic bombs only by the counter-threat of American atom bombs — and almost everybody in the Pentagon knew it.

But infantry-minded officers and the State Department could not abandon their program

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for the ground defense of Europe's eastern frontier.

Consequently, the White House was induced to issue secret instructions for Pentagon to continue the European defense plans as though the Russians had not produced the atomic explosion. The White House ordered the military personnel not to admit that the explosion was unexpected, or to intimate that Russia's possession of the atomic bomb might necessitate a drastic change in Allied defense strategy. The show had to go on.

Thus the American people were reassured by Administration leaders that the atomic explosion in Russia did not require a new concept for our own defense. Even today we hear the campaign cry that the present program *will keep war away from our homeland.* This, of course, is untrue.

The pretense that our six divisions could aid appreciably in the ground defense of Europe was justified privately by most military men on "psychological" grounds. They hoped to encourage Europeans to rise in their own defense, even as they kept alive the American hope that the defense of this country lay in a European holding line.

Actually, as military men knew, and as the Forrestal Diary states, our principal military strength and our only hope to deter war was concentrated in our atomic bombs and bombers, and not in our few divisions of infantry and scattered ground forces of our Allies. Word went around the Pentagon that if war came it would be our war, but *fortunately fought in Europe,* and what aid we could get from our Allies would be pure velvet.

Nevertheless, Administration and Pentagon leaders today cling to their original concept of ground defense. Liaison bulletin 257, dated February 1, 1952, published by the Department of the Army, expresses this antiquated doctrine neatly:

> "The individual rifleman is the most effective and most essential weapon against the enemy. All other services exist to support the infantry soldier."

Although the defense picture is confused and the strategy faulty, our problem is not insuperable if we will but think our way out.

There is no absolute defense against the ghastly threat of atomic bombs and missiles. Land armies endeavoring to hold a line in Europe are no defense whatsoever from atomic assault. The only possible defense lies in our ability to retaliate.

The best defense of Paris, London and New York City is our capacity to destroy Moscow. Neither the Army nor the Fleet can do this. It can only be achieved by Air Power, *supported by the Army and Fleet.*

A citizen's only defense against a criminal is the majesty of the law which imposes punishment. Likewise, America's only defense against Red atomic attack and ground invasion of Europe is the retaliatory potential of air power.

THE LESSON IS CLEAR. We must have American global air supremacy. It is essential to deter war and for the protection of Europe and our homeland.

Air power and the atomic bomb will make the next war *FINAL.* The ultra-violence of atomic bombing is so terrific that — in the entire world — there is neither retreat nor escape. Because civilization, as we know it, cannot long survive such intense war, the destiny of America and the free world depends upon our prompt achievement of global air supremacy. There must be no further delay in the decision to create the only force which will insure our survival.

We need a strategic bombing force capable of repeated atomic attacks anywhere over Red territory. We need a small but adequate professional Army and our present strength fleet to protect and supply essential bases. These bases must be located so that neither the Red Army nor the swarms of Red short-range aircraft can reach them.

We need thousands of interceptors — fighter aircraft — to defend these bases and key industrial and population centers against Red bombers.

After these requirements are met and only after they are met do we dare invest heavily in Foreign Aid. The cost of such an effective program is less than our present Defense and Foreign Aid expenditures.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

If a free economy is to survive, economists are fairly in accord that total taxes cannot long exceed 25% of our national income. For the fiscal year 1952, our National Income — the highest in our history — may reach the $300 billion mark. The maximum tax available under a sound economy program is therefore $75 billion. Take from this $21 billion for state and local taxes; take $14 billion to operate the civil branches of the Federal Government (a thirty per cent cut) and we have $40 billion remaining for Defense and Foreign Aid.

Going back to our priorities for defense — Air Power first, Army-Navy second, Foreign Aid third — we could allocate some two-thirds of the total for Air Power. Most of the remainder would go to the Army and Navy. Foreign Aid would have to be cut drastically.*

Such a defense program for a decade would give us American global air supremacy which is conceded to be the best known war deterrent. It would also enable us to win if war comes. It would provide a larger budget for the Army and Navy than they were authorized three years ago; it would enable them to perform their most vital missions effectively. American global air supremacy would give Europe far more protection than the present NATO program of flimsy ground defense with inadequate air cover.

With this program taxes could be reduced about 15 per cent. The budget could be balanced. The chance for security and peace would be immeasurably strengthened. By reliance on Air Power as our preeminent arm, compulsory Universal Military Training would be unnecessary.

There is another important measure which must be undertaken. Full-scale exploitation of Russia's greatest vulnerability — her dissatisfied enslaved population — should be initiated by the American people as distinct from the State Department. There is reason to believe that with our support of anti-Communist underground, the Russian people might, in time, liberate themselves.

IN THIS MOST CRITICAL of all campaigns, how do our candidates stand on the overriding issue of Defense?

Senator Taft has detailed his views. He is against UMT. He would leave our 6 divisions in Europe but tighten foreign aid until we build air supremacy. He would make maximum use of General MacArthur. He holds it is a defeatist attitude not to be able to defend ourselves, even if Europe is occupied. For the defense of the free world he champions American global air supremacy.

General Eisenhower favors UMT, supports the Administration's European defense program, would extend the NATO concept into the Orient, would balance our budget, would consult with General MacArthur if available, and holds that "if we allow western Europe to fall within the Communist orbit . . . the cost will be back breaking, and we'll be in mortal danger". Yet, he has stated that air power is dominant in war.

General MacArthur, possible dark horse, has stated positive views on the Pacific. The country would like to hear more of his military ideas in detail.

Senator Russell possibly does not endorse the Truman-Acheson strategy, but has not yet clarified his views. Russell says he would rely on MacArthur's counsel.

Senator Kefauver, and other Democratic candidates, among them Harriman, Kerr and Barkley, would probably continue the policy of Truman and Acheson.

Two weeks remain before the first convention opens. The candidates have the floor and the people are listening. Let our candidates speak out and the delegates decide.

* Until negotiations succeed in Korea, the cost of the war there must continue to be met by supplemental appropriations.

BRIG. GENERAL BONNER FELLERS, USA, Ret'd., has contributed frequently to HUMAN EVENTS. He is a graduate of the USMA, the Command and General Staff School, and the Army War College. From 1940 to 1942 he was U.S. observer with the British forces in the Middle East. In 1943 he joined General MacArthur as chief of his war plans section. He was also Psychological Warfare Officer against Japan, military secretary to General MacArthur and Secretary General to the Allied Council of Japan. He holds the Distinguished Service Medal (with Oak leaf cluster).

ADDITIONAL COPIES: One—$.20; six—1.00; ten—1.50; fifty—5.50; one hundred—10.00. Quotations for larger quantities on request.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

HUMAN EVENTS

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor* FRANK [illegible]OROV, *Associate Editor*

Vol. IX, No. 25 Wednesday, June 18, 1952 Washington, D. C.

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA RECEIVED JUL 2 1952 LIBRARY

The Myth of 1912: If it were not so widely propagated, it would be downright silly. But the fact is that today Candidate Taft is pictured throughout the land as mounted on a political steamroller, crushing in his path all opposition from the masses of Republican voters. The Senator's father, President William Howard Taft in 1912 did this very thing — when he sought re-election that year, found that former President Theodore Roosevelt blocked his way and used all the power of a President who is head of the Party machine to beat the Bull Moose opposition. The difference — which invalidates this attempt to draw a parallel — is contained in one word "patronage".

President William Howard Taft in 1912 was able to swamp opposition in the Convention by his power of Federal patronage. As a matter of fact, all Presidents of whatever party have possessed this supreme power and it is a political axiom that, if a President so desires, he can obtain renomination from his convention without the shadow of a doubt. (Frank Kent, in his classic *The Great Game of Politics*, has a vivid description of why and how.) President Truman, if he wants to, can unquestionably obtain renomination at the Democratic Convention next month.

The Republican Party today — unlike in 1912 — is not in power in the Federal Government and has no Federal patronage. Senator Robert A. Taft has no Federal patronage. What power in party matters he holds comes from the usual pre-nominating exertions of his political workers, as in 1940 and 1948. There is no Taft steamroller in the sense of 1912.

In truth, a "steamroller" can only be effectively fueled by patronage. In this nominating campaign of 1952, while there has been no Federal patronage, there has been patronage on the state level. And it has been the Eisenhower organization which has held and used the bulk of state patronage.

Most of the delegate backing for the General is found in the states of New York, New Jersey, New Hampshire, Maine, Connecticut, Vermont, Colorado and Washington, where Republican governors control state machines. Taft has enjoyed similar fruits of power only in a few Western states, such as Utah, represented by rather small state delegations. Taft's biggest gains of delegates have been in the primaries of Illinois, Indiana and Ohio, where the Democratic Governors hold sway, and Wisconsin where a pro-Eisenhower Governor stayed neutral.

How then did the Taft forces gain ascendancy in the Republican Party national apparatus? Taft forces, during the past three years, simply moved into the vacuum left by the cohorts of Governor Dewey, who were in retreat after the latter's defeat in '48. Thus, local Party leaders sympathetic to the Ohioan tended to take over more power and were joined by various other leaders who had been Dewey and Stassen followers, but who had become disillusioned of "me-tooism". It was quite a natural development.

Mutual recriminations about "steamroller" and "strong-arm" tactics are not likely to impress old political hands. This sort of tit-for-tat business is an old political custom. Neither side is as white as it claims, nor as black as its opponent alleges.

Nor do statistics suggest that the Republican Party necessarily faces any such split as occurred in 1912. The Washington *Evening Star* on June 15 reported that, whereas there were 254 disputed seats for delegates in 1912, "this year the number under dispute is expected to go between 75 and 100". It should be noted that in the year of the Bull Moose, the disputes were on seats scattered all over the country, while in this year the disputes are largely in the South, a chronic sufferer from such ills.

Copyright 1952 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.
Published weekly at 1136 Eighteenth Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Actually, therefore, the parallel with 1912 as presented by many commentators should hold no terrors for Party delegates, if it is regarded as what it really is — a myth.

Political Talk: Paul Hoffman of the Ike campaign team has been trying to make deals, according to the grapevine. He is said to have offered Senator Knowland (Calif.) the second place on the ticket; and to have promised a prominent West Coast newspaper publisher the post of Ambassador to Britain.

—— There are persistent reports that Tom Curran, Dewey's Secretary of State, favors Taft for the nomination, and may declare himself publicly ere long. The Taft crowd boast that they have made progress in New York City, with their candidate controlling 16 delegates from metropolitan New York.

—— Averell Harriman is the butt of jokes from many Democratic leaders in the Capital. One of their cracks is: "How can you elect a man who travels about with a croquet mallet in his luggage?" Harriman is known among his friends as an enthusiastic croquet player.

—— On Capitol Hill, there is much talk that Senator Brien McMahon of Connecticut may retire from his seat before long. This year might see two Senatorial races in the Nutmeg state, as was the case in 1950.

The Liability of New York: Antagonism towards the nation's largest city has cropped up far more often in this campaign year than formerly. In the nomination races of both parties, suggestion that a candidate comes from New York chills the local politicos "in the sticks" and the promise "he can carry New York" leaves leaders out in the country cold. They recall how Dewey got New York's electoral vote, but lost the election in 1948. One of the best expressions of this phenomenon we have seen was in a recent speech — much noticed hereabouts — by Chairman Ansel B. Solenberger of Winchester, Va., in the Virginia Republican State Convention.

"If we are to fashion a Republican victory", said Mr. Solenberger, "after five successive Presidential defeats and ten out of eleven Congressional defeats, we must abandon the Willkie-Dewey type of campaign, run by New York-minded men, and develop a new campaign strategy. Such a new strategy will aim at building a Republican majority without the all too doubtful support of New York."

But how to win? Mr. Solenberger answers: "A Republican victory in November cannot be fashioned by trying to win the voters of the New and Fair Deal. Victory can only be won by adding to the full Republican strength the votes of those Jeffersonian Democrats who are on the side of Liberty, and who are just over the party line from us. There are millions of them. But they won't vote with us on a 'me-too' basis."

Socialized Medicine: Tuesday, June 17, saw the end of a battle in which, for five weeks, a band of House Republicans (led by Reed [N.Y.], Curtis [Nebr]., Simpson [Pa.] and Jenkins [Ohio]) made a grim and gallant effort to defeat the Administration's determination to railroad a vote-buying security bill (H.R. 7800) through Congress before the election. The vote was 360 to 22 and the bill now goes to the Senate where it is sure to pass.

Among the bill's numerous provisions, two are crucial: (1) The Old Age and Survivors Insurance Benefit is raised $5 a month with no social security tax increase to sustain it. This is the vote-buying feature. (2) The "insurance" rights of permanently and totally disabled persons previously on the rolls are frozen. This opens the door to socialized medicine since nobody disabled can qualify without medical certification and the regulations obviously can be laid down by no one but the Administrator — Oscar Ewing or whoever holds his job.

Herculean efforts over the weekend of May 17-18 roused the doctors of the country and, when the bill first came to a vote, on May 19, Reed and his friends were able to defeat it, to the utter astonishment and consternation of Chairman Doughton of the Ways and Means Committee. After a lull of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

10 days, in which every effort was made to persuade the home folks that the opposition was trying to starve the aged to death, the bill was trimmed of a few of its most alarming phrases and hustled to the floor once more — with the socialized medicine time bomb intact. Despite Reed's best efforts, he and his crowd were licked.

The bitterest reflection on the whole episode is that reasonable alternatives to the present system exist, but nothing effective has ever been done to rally the opposition to one of the alternatives. Curtis has tried in the House, Cain has tried in the Senate. There have been some other sporadic efforts, but Congress lives in mortal fear of social security legislation, the old folks vote is ever in mind and the subject is complex and calls for much elucidation. The prospects of the fight against socialized medicine do not look favorable today.

Congressional Investigation: One committee on Capitol Hill has unearthed data of a very startling nature in recent weeks. We are assured that in the near future, this material will be made public. We have our fingers crossed. For we also hear that very strong pressure is being exerted to keep the facts secret.

This committee's staff has been delving into the records of campaign contributions. They have discovered that some individuals, well known as Republicans, have made larger contributions to Democratic chests than to those of the GOP. One instance showed that the individual gave $5,000 to a GOP campaign committee, but at the same time five times as much, or $25,000, to a Democratic campaign committee.

Now these particular individuals are not "liberal" Republicans. They have long been classified as of the "anti-me-too" variety, as supporters of Taft, Bricker, Dirksen, etc. At least, that is the way they talk and express themselves to others. Hence, the motives for their strange conduct can hardly be regarded as springing from an ideology.

Nor does the motivation fall into the traditional category of just "paying both sides". It is well, although not generally, known that certain vested interests and individuals contribute to both parties, or to both candidates in some campaigns. But, in these cases, the donations are usually in exactly equal amounts.

The disproportion in the cases above mentioned has excited the curiosity of members of the investigation committee, who are speculating rather cynically about the motivations. The committee might call some of these dispensers of funds and ask some rather pointed questions.

The Gates of Inflation: It had to happen. There was nothing else for the Treasury to do, after the public had turned down its "savings" bonds (as reported in last week's HUMAN EVENTS), but to go to the banks and financial institutions with marketable bonds. On Monday, June 16, the government opened its books for the biggest cash financing operation since the war. It needed $3.5 billion very badly. It got the money in one day.

Why not? These are not the kind of bonds you keep "under the mattress" until maturity. The banks can turn them into cash at any time. If the investment drains their reserves they can discount the bonds with the Federal Reserve System and replenish the reserves. They can do the same thing if they need cash for commercial borrowings. In short, this kind of paper can be "monetized" and is therefore inflationary.

The market estimates that the commercial banks will get about $1.5 billion of these bonds, the non-bank subscribers about $2 billion. But, this does not mean that the latter will keep them until maturity; there is a quick profit turnover gimmick in the transaction and many speculators will take advantage of it. The banks will eventually get most of the issue.

Thus, the "savings" bonds which were sold to the public during the war, with the argument that they would "prevent inflation", are now being replaced with bonds that are a prime cause of inflation. It had to happen, given the basic inflationary urge of politics.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It is interesting to note that the new bonds were offered only "after weeks of market studies and advice from the financial community", as the *Wall Street Journal* puts it. This means that the Treasury people did not arbitrarily set the interest rate and the maturity date until after they had shopped around and found out what the market would take. This is a far cry from the "controlled interest" ideas that Henry Morganthau and the Harvard economists propagated during the war.

A German View: As tension in the world situation mounts, the Germans show little enthusiasm about lining up with the Western powers against Soviet Russia. We have obtained a copy of a broadcast from the Stuttgart radio station in Western Germany of May 16, in which the commentator, Karl Silex, says:

"If the Americans are convinced that a solution along the lines contained in the Soviet proposals coincides with their own interests, and if the American over-all situation towards the Soviets could thereby be improved, it becomes clear then that the shifting of the accent of American foreign policy toward the East as advocated by John Foster Dulles would thereby be greatly facilitated." [This well known American diplomat has recently been urging a stronger U.S. policy in the Far East and less emphasis on the building of a barrier to Soviet aggression in Europe.]

"The opportunity for such a solution", says the German commentator, "has also been incorporated in the German treaty by the American representatives. Dulles' statements thus constitute a further reason for the disappearance of the integration clause from the German treaty. Why, then, should the Germans themselves place obstacles in the road toward reunification by pledging a future all-German state unchangeably to the West even before it is born, and why should they do so at a time when American foreign policy shows critical tendencies indicating that some day the United States might welcome a German independent buffer state between the power groups as definitely beneficial to American interests, and that such a buffer state might be preferred to the danger that lies in the perpetuation of Germany's cleavage?"

Book Front: The *Times* book review section is at it again — or, if you will, still. In the past year, the review section took a severe drubbing at the hands of Irene Kuhn (in her famous piece in the *American Legion Monthly*) and from Sen. Owen Brewster in a speech and remarks in the *Congressional Record*. The journalist and the Senator drew up an indictment of the *Times* on the score of favoring pro-Communist books on the Far East, and for treating anti-Communist books less favorably. It is well known that the *Times* book review section has enoromus influence on the success or failure of books in the trade. After the above attacks, many persons felt that the review editors bent to the new wind and were pursuing a more equitable policy. But now, this week, criticism is rising again — over the *Times*' handling of two significant books.

The two books are Louis Budenz' *The Cry Is Peace* (Regnery) and Ralph de Toledano's *Spies, Dupes & Diplomats* (Little, Brown), just published. Both works are sharply anti-Communist and emphasize the lethal results of Red infiltration in the United States. Neither author is exactly kind towards the Administration's policy on China and the Far East. Last Sunday, June 15, the *Times* gave rather unfavorable reviews to both these books.

Hence, the *Times* is under fire again. It is immediately noted that the individuals who wrote the reviews are members of the *New York Times* staff. Why — it is asked — did the *Times* choose these men instead of professional book reviewers like Granville Hicks or Dr. Sidney Hook? Neither reviewer has particularly qualified himself as an expert on the subject matter in the books. The editorial policy of the paper has been what is commonly called "anti-anti-Communist". Therefore, has the *Times* — as in years past on the subject of China policy — carried over its editorial policy into the pages of its book review section?

Entered as second class matter at the Post Office, Washington, D. C.

Quotation up to a paragraph is permitted with credit to HUMAN EVENTS. For reproduction or more extensive quotation address requests to HUMAN EVENTS, 1136 Eighteenth Street, N.W., Washington 6, D.C. Trial subscription, three months for $3. Six months, $5.50. One year, $10. Two years, $18. Domestic airmail (including APO and FPO) one year, $12.00; foreign (regular mail) one year, $11. Foreign airmail rates on request. Please remit in U.S.A. DOLLARS. Allow two weeks for new subscription or change in address to become effective.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED